

truckers carried HIV from one end of the road to the other, stopping regularly for paid sex with women who needed the money to feed themselves or their families. The women infected their boyfriends and husbands, who infected their wives and girlfriends.

Today, the villages along this road are outposts in an AIDS wasteland, peopled almost entirely by grandparents and children. The middle generation lies in village graveyards.

One grandmother, Benedete Nakayima, 70, says she has lost 11 of her 12 children to HIV—six daughters and five sons. She now cares for 35 grandchildren with the help of her surviving daughter.

At the Namuli funeral, Marum reads a letter from the U.S. first lady, wishing Namuli a speedy recovery.

Sandra Thurman, the Clinton administration's top AIDS official, who is visiting here in her last stop in a tour of four sub-Saharan countries assaulted by AIDS, was to have delivered the letter to Namuli's bedside at Mulago Hospital on Feb. 7.

She was too late.

Namuli died of pneumonia two days earlier—because Mulago Hospital lacked a working oxygen compressor that might have helped her through her respiratory crisis.

Her two sons, Moses, 5, and Isaac, 7, have joined the ranks of Uganda's orphans.

"We are going to sing a song of thanks that she died in Christ," says the preacher, wearing a black suit in bold defiance of the searing midday sun. He consults a hymnal that has been translated into Lugandan, the Bagandans' native tongue. He leads almost 100 men, women and children in Jesus, I'm Coming.

Soon, it is Lucy Mugoda's turn to speak.

Mugoda, one of Namuli's co-workers at the information center, wastes no time on platitudes or prayers. She has a message: HIV holds no respect for tradition; it seeks simply to perpetuate itself through any means possible.

Namuli died, Mugoda says, not because she was promiscuous or willfully engaged in risky behavior, but because she accepted her traditional obligations as "heir to an auntie."

"Let her death serve as an example that not all the old traditions are good," Mugoda says.

"This tradition is death."

HEALTH OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

SPEECH OF

HON. DEBORAH PRYCE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1999

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to add my voice to those who seek to raise awareness about the importance of biomedical research to call attention to the invaluable benefits of biomedical research and to the necessity of making a sustained, significant commitment to research efforts at NIH, our nation's premier research institution. I encourage all of my colleagues to join me in supporting a doubling of the National Institute of Health's budget, including the budget of the National Cancer Institute, over five years.

The Federal investment in cancer research makes sense and saves dollars by unlocking the answers to how cancer is best detected, treated, and prevented. These answers will reduce health care costs and save lives. The

costs, both human and economic, of cancer in this country are catastrophic. The human costs in terms of lives lost are immeasurable, and the economic costs exceed \$107 billion annually. Our national investment in biomedical research is the key to containing spiraling health care costs, as every \$1 invested in research saves \$13 in health care costs. Yet, the amount we invest in cancer research today is equal to only 2 percent of the health care costs attributable to cancer. And while cancer is a greater threat than ever, only 31 percent of approved cancer research projects receive funding. Our goal should be to quicken the pace of research by funding at least 45 percent of research initiatives. A much more aggressive effort is required to combat cancer and to reduce human suffering and lives lost to the many forms of this devastating disease.

According to a 1994 NIH report, approximately \$4.3 billion is invested in clinical and translation research, which means \$9.3 to \$13.6 billion is shaved off annual health care costs. As a result of a research investment of \$56 million over 17 years, \$166 million is saved annually in the care of testicular cancer, a 91 percent cure rate has been achieved, and life expectancy has increased by 40 more years. And, a research investment of \$11 million in the management of breast cancer has saved \$170 million annually in breast cancer treatment.

More cancer research could prevent cancer, save more lives, and benefit the economy, as well. Eighty-five percent of the National Cancer Institute's (NCI) budget creates jobs and funds researchers across the country. And NCI research provides the foundation for innovative new cancer drug development—316 new medicines were in development last year. Since 1993, the number of cancer drugs in development has increased 155 percent.

More biomedical research at NIH overall is critically important. Indeed, the sharing of medical innovations across scientific and medical disciplines benefits all research. For example, AIDS research has advanced cancer research and research on maternal health has been applied to arthritis research.

Research pays for itself many times over by creating American jobs, supporting U.S. businesses, and strengthening the U.S. economy. Notably, NIH-funded research generates \$17.9 billion in employee income and over 726,000 jobs in the pharmaceutical, biotechnology, and medical fields. Overall, NIH-funded research contributes \$100 billion annually to the American economy.

Doubling the budget of the NIH and the NCI will enable extraordinary opportunities for research success and real progress in cancer prevention, detection, treatment, and survivorship. To make a real difference in the lives of the 1 in 2 American men and 1 in 3 American women who will develop cancer over his or her lifetime, we must dramatically increase our Federal investment in cancer research.

TRIBUTE TO AMBASSADOR YORAM BEN-ZE'EV

HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1999

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Ambassador Yoram Ben-Ze'ev as he

steps down as Consul General of Israel in Los Angeles and is promoted to Deputy Director General for North American Affairs in the Foreign Ministry of Israel.

It is not often that a member of this House rises to pay this high honor to a foreign diplomat. As one of the most effective diplomats and committed servants assigned to represent his country in the United States, Yoram Ben-Ze'ev is one truly worthy of this distinction.

Throughout his career, he has worked to improve relations between Israel and other nations, serving from Hong Kong, to the Foreign Ministry in Jerusalem, to Los Angeles. Ambassador Ben-Ze'ev has served since 1993 as the Deputy Director General for the Middle East Peace Process; and since 1995 as Consul General, based in Los Angeles and responsible for the Western States.

He has been intimately involved in the peace process negotiations which have transformed Israel's relations with the world. All the while, he has effectively ensured that the people of the Western United States can do business with Israel, travel to that country, and understand its rich culture and history. He has done much to strengthen the relationship between the United States and Israel.

As Israel looks to this next and most critical phase of the peace process, Ambassador Ben-Ze'ev will no doubt once again provide exemplary service to his country, contribute to its security and stability, and strengthen the US-Israel partnership.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, please join me in honoring this most distinguished diplomat and public servant for his tireless work on behalf of friendship between the Israeli and American people. Let us extend our best wishes to Yoram and his wife, Iris, as they return to Israel.

THE TOWN OF WAWAYANDA SESQUICENTENNIAL

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1999

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of our colleagues an agrarian Town in my District that is rich in heritage and tradition. These fine qualities and the town's deep rooted 150 year history will be acknowledged on August 7th at the Wawayanda Sesquicentennial Celebration.

Located in Western Orange County, the town of Wawayanda is comprised of 22,000 acres or 33.6 square miles of land. This land supports Wawayanda's thriving farm production. Seeded in New York's fertile "Black Dirt Region" and surrounded by the Wallkill River and the Indigot and Rutgers Creeks, Wawayanda has established itself throughout its 150 year history as one of New York's finest farming towns. Wawayanda provides a generous amount of natural resources such as dairy products, grain and vegetable crops, lettuce, pumpkins and onions.

Also being celebrated is the Town's deep rooted heritage. This including historic buildings and museums that go back to the early 1800's. The Dolson family, the Gardner family and the Davis family are just a few of the early settlers immortalized in the Town of Wawayanda. Wawayanda maintains its storied

heritage in the buildings and town areas that carry the names of those who originally settled there. Many of these people colonized Wawayanda just after the Revolutionary War. The first town census in 1855 totaled at 2,069. Today Wawayanda boasts a population of 5,518.

Wawayanda also boasts a great commercial asset in Interstate Route 84. Route 84 acts as a commercial crossroads, plugging Wawayanda into surrounding towns as well as both Pennsylvania to the west and New England to the East. Route 84 is an exceptional asset to the economy of Wawayanda. It provides a means of farm export and opens other areas of New York. This road enables the beautiful Town of Wawayanda to share its assets with others. People can travel Route 84 to experience Wawayanda's lush landscapes and surrounding waterways. Route 84 opens up the beautiful Town of Wawayanda, enabling it to be experienced by others.

Congratulations on this day should be given to those who made the Sesquicentennial possible. The efforts of Town Supervisor Thomas De Block, his Town Council, and the Sesquicentennial Committee should all be commended. If not for these people's pride and dedication to their town the celebration of this Town's history would not have been possible. Their efforts are indicative of the pride and tradition that makes this Town so special.

Accordingly, I invite my colleagues on August 7, 1999, to recognize the Town of Wawayanda in New York State for its 150 years of rich tradition and excellence in America.

CONTINUING CRISIS IN KASHMIR

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 1, 1999

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern for the ongoing conflict in the Kashmir region of India. This crisis is nearing a turning point for which the outcome is far from being clear. It is extremely important that in addressing this turning point, the United States should act pursuant to its own national and strategic interests rather than succumb to the allure of simplistic short-term "arrangements."

The conflict in Kashmir has been unfolding for nearly two months now. The Kargil crisis erupted in early May when the Indian Army discovered the infiltration of Pakistani regular troops and an assortment of ISI-sponsored Mujahideen into the northern parts of Indian Kashmir. From these captured positions, the Pakistani forces were close to being able to disconnect India's national highway—the blood line to the country's uppermost northern regions. In the fighting that has since ensued, the Indian Army was able to first contain the infiltration and then doggedly evict the Pakistani forces from positions inside India. This fighting, conducted in the extremely rugged and high-elevation terrain of the Himalayan mountains, still continues as Indian troops climb one mountain after another to dislodge the Pakistani forces sheltered at the peaks. The Indian government is determined, and rightly so, to evict all the infiltrators.

While taking place in a remote and desolate part of the world, the Kargil fighting is not con-

ducted in isolation. In threatening the Indian national highway, the Pakistani intrusion has been of strategic significance—and so is its defeat. Therefore, the stakes are very high for both New Delhi and Islamabad. Indeed, fully aware of the explosive character of the Kargil crisis, New Delhi has instructed the Indian Army to operate only within Indian territory in removing the infiltrators, despite the military expediency of operating in the rear of the enemy and a higher cost in Indian casualties due to frontal assaults on towering peaks.

Presently, with the fighting in the Kargil area stabilizing in India's favor, Pakistan is in dire need for a dramatic breakout to salvage some achievements from an otherwise doomed strategic gambit. Moreover, Beijing—Pakistan's closest ally and strategic patron that has its own territorial claims for parts of Indian Kashmir—is expressing growing interest in the outcome of the crisis. The People's Republic of China (PRC) is ready to intervene in the crisis in order to safeguard its own strategic interests.

In order to meet the prerequisites of such a breakout Pakistan has been pursuing a twin track policy:

On the one hand, Islamabad has been threatening the escalation of the crisis into a major war that, given the declared nuclear status of both protagonists, might escalate into a nuclear war. In order to ensure that Islamabad's threat of war is considered credible, the Pakistani Armed Forces have undertaken several steps since mid June. Pakistan put the Armed Forces on "red alert", sent the Navy out to sea, is moving military reinforcements to the border with India, parading units through the streets of cities and towns, is conducting civil and home defense exercises for the population, as well as deploying air defense forces to all airports and key civilian sites.

On the other hand, Pakistan, with Beijing's active support, has been raising the possibility of a "negotiated settlement" to the Kargil crisis. In these political initiatives, the Pakistanis stress the need to resolve the crisis before it escalates out of control and a major, and potentially nuclear, war erupts. In reality, Islamabad is desperate to extract tangible gains from the cross-border intrusion of its forces before they are defeated and evicted by the Indian Army. And it is in these circumstances that the proposed negotiated solutions for the Kargil crisis are being offered.

The most popular "package deal" which the Clinton administration seems to favor at this juncture calls for Islamabad's quiet an unacknowledged withdrawing of the Pakistani troops in return for the opening of an international negotiations process over the entire Kashmir problem. Such dynamics, the deal's proponents tell us, will provide Pakistan with a "face-saving" outlet out of the armed conflict before it escalates into a wider war.

However, there are many pitfalls in this approach. In all political discussions to-date, the Pakistani forces involved are still formally defined as "militants"—thus absolving Pakistan of the formal responsibility for what can otherwise be termed an act of war. Further more, the mere international acceptance without challenge of the Pakistani excuse that these "militants" are operating in an area where the Line of Control (the Indo-Pakistani cease-fire line in Kashmir) is not properly delineated and that therefore these "militants" are actually on

Pakistani soil, contradicts the 1972 Simla Agreement between India and Pakistan. This argument is therefore making a mockery of any such bilateral agreements at the very moment both New Delhi and Islamabad are being urged by the international community to negotiate and ultimately sign yet another agreement on the "Kashmir problem." Then, the commonly discussed percept of the "Kashmir problem" refers to the conditions of the Muslim population living in the Kashmir valley. Thus, the negotiations will delve on the fate of the Indian held part of Kashmir even though India, Pakistan and even the PRC each controls wide segments of the British-era Kashmir.

Ultimately, international acceptance of these principles will reward Pakistan for its armed aggression and punish India for its self-restraint in evicting the intruders. Moreover, any political outcome in which Pakistan's interests are met will also reward Beijing. The PRC, one should note, has just tested in a major military exercise in nearby Tibet, a quick reaction intervention force optimized for the region's rugged terrain. Moreover, the new strategic posture at the heart of Asia that will emerge from these negotiations will serve as a precedent for similar aggressive wars-by-proxy that could then be repeated and adopted throughout the developing world to the detriment of the interests of the United States and its Western allies.

Mr. Speaker, in our pursuit to defuse a brewing crisis before it escalates into a war we should not ignore the overall enduring strategic interests of the United States. The United States does have long-term vital interests in Asia. Democratic and pro-Western India is a bulwark of stability in a region rife with such anti-U.S. forces and mega-trends as the hegemonic ascent of a PRC determined to become the regional supreme power at the expense of the United States, the spread of radical militant Islam and Islamist terrorism, as well as the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction and long-range delivery systems by rogue states. At the same time, free access to the energy resources of Central Asia is crucial for the long-term economic development of the United States, while the sea lanes of communications in the Indian Ocean sustain the West's commercial relations with East Asia.

Thus, any "Kashmir" agreement based on the principles mentioned above will weaken India, reward and encourage the anti-U.S. forces, and will thus adversely affect the long-term national interests of the United States.

It is, therefore, in the self-interest of the United States to pursue a negotiated process that will take into consideration the U.S. quintessential dynamics and interests in the region and will thus secure the American national interest. Such a process might take longer to define and be more intricate to attain. However, a genuine solution to such a complex problem as the Kashmir dispute will most likely endure future trials and tribulation. Thus, a genuine solution will ensure at the least a semblance of stability in a turbulent region that is of great importance to the United States. Congress should therefore encourage the Clinton administration to adopt such a principled approach to formulating the U.S. position toward the Kargil crisis. Congress should make sure the U.S. position does not reward aggression, challenge the viability of the principle that legitimate international agreements